

# Tewkesbury Borough Plan Examination

Sandra Ford  
Head of Development Services  
Tewkesbury Borough Council  
Gloucester Road  
Tewkesbury  
GL20 5TT

16 June 2021

Dear Ms Ford

## **TEWKESBURY BOROUGH PLAN (TBP)**

1. Further to the recent examination hearings I have now been able to complete the necessary site visits and have given careful consideration to the various issues raised. I have also taken full account of the Council's latest suggested changes in the recent documents CD011c and CD011d, a series of further notes from the Council and various representations and comments from interested parties, all of which are published on the examination website. No further submissions will now be considered from any party until the main modification (MM) consultation stage.
2. The duty to co-operate during the preparation of the plan has been met. I have concluded that the plan as submitted is not sound in certain respects, but it can be made sound by a series of MMs. I am now able to provide an outline of the MMs to the plan which are required for soundness. Reasons for some of the MMs are given in this letter to assist understanding but some further explanation will be set out in my final report. The appendix to this letter sets out the full list of MMs required and includes many not mentioned below as they do not require explanation at this stage.

### Housing provision

3. JCS Policy SP1 sets the housing requirement for Tewkesbury Borough as at least 9,900 new homes over the plan period 2011-31 (495 pa) towards which Policy SP2 makes provision for at least 7,445 dwellings leaving a shortfall of 2,455 dwellings to be addressed through the review of the JCS required by Policy REV1. Table SP2a makes clear that the TBP is expected to identify further potential for at least 315 dwellings. The RES1 allocations in the submitted TBP, taking account of a number of adjustments, provide for between 1,077 and 1,147 dwellings, and the deletion of the SHU1 and FOR1 sites for the reasons explained below would reduce this by 60, providing for between 1,017 and 1,087 dwellings, thus more than meeting the JCS requirement for the TBP. Of these, five allocations totalling 90 dwellings in the submitted TBP but with planning permission granted by April 2020 can now be deleted from the plan and shown as commitments within the respective settlement boundaries.
4. Separately from the process to identify allocations in the TBP, a number of other sites have been given planning permission since the JCS was adopted, some on appeal. As at April 2020, with the allocations to be included in the TBP and taking existing completions and commitments into account, a total provision of 9,337 dwellings has now been identified leaving a reduced shortfall of 563 to be met through the JCS review for the period to 2031<sup>1</sup>. As the JCS was adopted with a shortfall, in the case of

---

<sup>1</sup> TBC Matter 2 Statement Figure 3 adjusted for RES1 changes and deletion of SHU1 and FOR1



the TBP it is not essential for soundness to ensure a five year housing land supply at the time of adoption. Nevertheless, updating the calculation on page 114 of the JCS as at April 2020 demonstrates such a supply. In the interests of clarity and therefore effectiveness this should be included as an appendix in the TBP together with a revised trajectory to update that shown on pages 113/4 of the JCS.

5. Within the overall figure, JCS Policy SP2 provides for about 1,860 new homes in the two Rural Service Centres and about 880 new homes in the twelve Service Villages. As at April 2020, including completions and commitments, the allocations in the TBP will provide for 2,398 dwellings in the Rural Service Centres and, after deletion of allocation SHU1, 1,038 dwellings in the Service Villages, thus more than meeting the JCS requirement<sup>2</sup>.

#### Winchcombe

6. The allocation of the WIN1 site is sound given the provisions of the JCS, the context of the town and AONB designation. In relation to the precise boundaries of the allocation, these should respect the 115 m contour *and* existing field hedgerows for landscape reasons. The allocation should also include the site of No 2 Orchard Road to increase flexibility adjacent to Pickering House, but not the site of No 26 Delavale Road as whether this is a suitable and acceptable access point should be determined through the development management process. Finally, bullet point 4 of Policy WIN1 should be strengthened to ensure good pedestrian/cycling links from the site to the town. Having considered the alternatives put forward by the parties some wording is included in the appendix for the MM consultation.

#### Shurdington

7. Shurdington is a Service Village based on the settlement audit and as such JCS Policy SP2 potentially provides for some new housing. However, it is not a requirement of the policy and the Council's disaggregation formula takes no account of environmental or policy constraints, simply providing a guidance figure subject to those constraints. Uniquely in the Borough Shurdington is inset within the Green Belt with a tightly drawn boundary which has inevitably constrained development with few new houses built in recent decades and just 16 completions and commitments in the plan period to date.
8. However, once defined, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances given their intended permanence. Whilst JCS Policy SD5 allows for a 'limited review' of the Green Belt through the TBP 'as necessary' it does not require such a review in respect of Shurdington or lower the exceptional circumstances test.
9. The undeveloped gap between Gloucester and Cheltenham is narrow and Shurdington lies astride the A46 between the two urban areas. The extent of the Green Belt has already been reduced by the JCS through strategic allocations and land safeguarded for longer term development, and any further reduction, even limited in nature, requires strong justification. Whilst Shurdington has not grown like some other villages this is a consequence of its Green Belt location and there is no policy imperative for it to do so.
10. Housing allocation SHU1 would significantly extend housing development along the A46, encroach into the countryside to the south of the village and breach the existing strong boundary formed by Badgeworth Lane. The LUC Green Belt Review underplays the rural character of the site and its contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. As explained above, the JCS requirement to identify new housing in the TBP and the

---

<sup>2</sup> TBC Matter 2 Statement Figure 2 adjusted



service villages would be met without 50 houses on this site. Given this context the necessary exceptional circumstances to justify releasing the site from the Green Belt for housing purposes are not present.

11. However, the Green Belt inset boundary around the village does not appear to have been reviewed since its original designation in 1968 and it does not reflect the reality of built development on the fringes of the village. The purposes of the Green Belt would not be prejudiced by amending the boundaries to exclude the built-up areas further west along Badgeworth Lane, along the eastern side of the A46 (excluding the open land in the AONB) and along Leckhampton Lane. The latter amendment would include the site of housing allocation SHU2, allowing it to go ahead, but the site has housing on three sides and is secluded from outside view, so unlike SHU1 would not comprise an encroachment into the countryside. Recognising the existing built-up extent of the village in this way would meet the exceptional circumstances test.
12. The extended Green Belt boundary around the village would enable some further infilling and redevelopment and thus limited housing growth, albeit not of the scale proposed in the submitted TBP. In addition, TBP Policy RES6 in conjunction with NPPF paragraph 145(f) allows scope for affordable housing on exception sites beyond the settlement boundary should the need be demonstrated.

#### Minsterworth

13. Minsterworth is an unusual, highly linear village comprising mainly frontage housing interspersed with countryside gaps stretching along about 3 miles of the A48. Further housing of a similar nature is underway or committed at the western and eastern ends of the village and also in the middle, but many gaps remain. Although classified as a Service Village, no allocations are made in the submitted TBP but an extended settlement boundary is proposed which would allow further frontage development along the northern side of the road, linking the western and central parts of the village.
14. Whilst the settlement is characterised by ribbon development, the proposal to allow further continuous frontage housing, presumably with individual accesses directly off the A48, is contrary to the Council's criteria for defining settlement boundaries and would unduly compromise the intermittent character of the village. In order for the area subject to settlement boundary policies to be justified the boundary should be redrawn to exclude the undeveloped gap between Ellis Bank Lane and Enderley. The Parish Council view is that more in-depth development would be appropriate and that this should be concentrated near the Church, Village Hall and Old School. The Council may wish to consider this in putting forward a revised settlement boundary for consultation alongside the MMs.

#### Forthampton

15. Forthampton is a small dispersed village with few services and facilities and thus not classified as a Service Village suitable for significant development. Despite this, the submitted TBP includes a housing allocation for 10 dwellings to support the vitality of the village on the basis of community support for such a proposal. It is now clear from the views of the Parish Council that this community support is not clear cut. In the absence of this justification housing allocation FOR1 should be deleted from the plan and any proposals for the village considered under the enabling Policy RES4.



## Employment land

16. JCS Policy SP1 sets a requirement for a minimum of 192 ha additional B-class employment land across the JCS area to contribute towards the delivery of about 39,500 new jobs, much of which will be delivered on 112 ha of employment land identified in the JCS strategic allocations. 6 ha is allocated in Cheltenham, 31 ha either allocated or proposed in Gloucester and 43 ha of undeveloped land on existing allocated sites is carried forward in the TBP<sup>3</sup>. With planning permission granted for a further 3.5 ha in an extension to Ashville Business Park and 5.9 ha on land adjacent to Bamfurlong Industrial Park, a 2.2 ha allocation at Malvern View Business Park and 13.7 ha allocated for extensions to Rural Business Centres<sup>4</sup> (excluding the Toddington, Coombe Hill and Greet sites for the reasons explained below), a total of 217.3 ha employment generating land has been identified to date in the JCS area. This exceeds the JCS requirement for at least 192 ha with a reasonable surplus to allow flexibility, albeit also including land for some non B-class uses.
17. In addition, land could come forward under the permissive TBP Policies EMP3, EMP4 and EMP5, also as part of the emerging Tewkesbury Garden Town proposal in the JCS review. A significant amount of employment land is identified in the current concept plan, an initial part of which could come forward in the plan period.

### B4063/Cheltenham Road East employment sites

18. The TBP as submitted proposes the deletion of three sites from the Green Belt along the B4063/Cheltenham Road East and their allocation for employment purposes. These are 3.9 ha for an extension to the Ashville Business Park (site 1) on the northern side of the road together with 1.3 ha adjacent to the Meteor Business Park (site 2) and 4.2 ha adjacent to the Bamfurlong Industrial Park (site 3) on the southern side of the road. The latter two sites currently lie within Gloucestershire Airport and its 'essential operational area' (EOA). Planning permission was granted for site 1 in 2016 and for a 5.9 ha site, effectively sites 2 and 3 combined but adjacent to Bamfurlong Industrial Park, on 15 March 2021. In both cases the Council concluded there were very special circumstances which justified permission in the Green Belt. The development of site 1 has commenced but it remains substantially open land at present.
19. As stated above, once defined, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. JCS Policy SD5 allows for a 'limited review' of the Green Belt through the TBP but as with Shurdington it does not require such a review in the case of the B4063 sites or lower the exceptional circumstances test. However, JCS paragraph 4.1.28 allows the TBP to consider the need for different land uses to support the growth of the airport operation including reviewing the essential and non-essential operational area (NEOA). Taking this opportunity, the TBP proposes the extension of the 'South East Camp', the NEOA area on the southern side of the airport, to allow further expansion of businesses that require an airport location, and this will directly support the airport and its role in the Gloucestershire economy.
20. Importantly, the Green Belt between Gloucester and Cheltenham is vulnerable along the B4063 with the built up areas of Churchdown and the industrial estates leaving only short, intermittent, undeveloped gaps between the A40 roundabout and the planned Golden Valley development, itself a major release of previously Green Belt land. The gap between the Ashville/Meteor and Bamfurlong industrial estates is one of the last vestiges of open land separating Gloucester and Cheltenham along this road

<sup>3</sup> TBC Matter 5 statement and EXAM041

<sup>4</sup> EXAM041 Rural Business Centre sites excluding Toddington, Coombe Hill and Isbourne (Greet)



and makes a major contribution towards the Green Belt purposes of checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. The LUC Green Belt Review rightly concludes that the harm to the Green Belt from development of the airport land as a whole would be high, and this applies equally to smaller parcels of land adjacent to the B4063, particularly in combination with site 1 which alone would result in moderate harm.

21. The proposal to allocate sites 2 and 3 would also reduce the EOA of the airport, with the effect of this on its operations not yet clear, particularly on helicopter flights. Whilst the airport operators are confident that any effect would be manageable, the recent planning application was scaled back due to the uncertainty and the Civil Aviation Authority are yet to consider the implications of any reduced airport boundary and revised operating procedures. The larger scale proposal now promoted by the airport and Council<sup>5</sup> would have an even greater impact with unknown effects on the operation of the airport. With general agreement as to the importance of the airport to the local economy, its future is a strategic matter that should be considered through the JCS review and not prejudged by incremental decisions in the TBP.
22. For exceptional circumstances to exist to justify alterations to the Green Belt in this area, the need for releases must be clear and no other reasonable options available. Neither has been sufficiently established. Altering the Green Belt is not critical to the provision of 192 ha of B-class employment land across the JCS area, there is potential for employment land on non-Green Belt sites in the Borough, 4.5 ha of undeveloped land remains on the existing Ashville and Meteor Business Parks<sup>6</sup>, and high quality employment land is coming forward in strategic allocations nearby. If further land is required the safeguarded land already removed from the Green Belt could be brought forward rather than additional Green Belt releases along the B4063.
23. Whilst there is demand for further employment land in the vicinity of the airport, businesses that specifically need an airport location can be accommodated in the expanded NEOA. Should the sites be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for general employment use, businesses without a need to be located near the airport could be accommodated. Given the importance of maintaining the openness of the gap between the Ashville/Meteor and Bamfurlong industrial estates the 'very special circumstances' test that applies for development within the Green Belt should be retained unless and until the sites with planning permission are fully developed and the designation no longer serves a useful purpose. The allocations should therefore be removed from the TBP and Green Belt designation reinstated.

#### Toddington, Coombe Hill and Isbourne (Greet) employment sites

24. The submitted TBP allocates 6.5 ha of land as an extension to the Orchard Industrial Estate at Toddington on the triangular shaped field to the south west and land on the opposite side of the B4078. However, the sites are in an open rural landscape, just to the south of the Cotswolds AONB and in the Policy LAN1 Special Landscape Area which recognises its contribution to the setting of the AONB. The site is detached from any built-up area, not well connected to the principal road network and would offer little opportunity for sustainable modes of transport. The site was put forward for inclusion in the 2006 Local Plan but was rejected by the local plan inspector.

---

<sup>5</sup> Following the airport's response to the Regulation 19 consultation, the Council propose the removal of a further 8.1 ha from the Green Belt and EOA on the northern side of the airport and its allocation as employment land in addition to sites 2 and 3.

<sup>6</sup> EXAM 041 M5 Central Sites 5, 12 & 15



25. The TBP also proposes to allocate 2.2 ha for an expansion of the Knightsbridge Business Centre at Coombe Hill (The Leigh). The site comprises the grass field to the west alongside the A4019. Although well connected to the M5 and adjacent to the planned expansion of Coombe Hill, the site lies in open countryside and would more than double the size of the existing industrial estate.
26. Development of the sites in both cases would be prominent to passers-by and unduly intrusive in the landscape. The sites are not essential for the provision of the JCS employment land requirement. Given their sensitive landscape context any proposals for the expansion of these sites should be considered under the provisions of Policy EMP4 rather than establishing the principle of development through a specific allocation in the TBP. The sites should therefore be deleted from the plan.
27. The owner of the Isbourne Business Centre at Greet has advised that the proposed expansion site is no longer available for development and should be deleted from the plan.

#### Gypsy and traveller sites

28. Based on the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment carried out in 2017, the supporting text to JCS Policy SD13 sets out the number of pitches and plots that are required in each district between 2016 and 2031, both for those that meet the definition in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) and those that do not. Contrary to the Council's view in EXAM027, the needs of the latter group should also be provided under the requirements of JCS Policy SD11 and the Housing and Planning Act 2016, albeit there is no need to demonstrate five years supply of deliverable sites for those that do not meet the definition.
29. The overall requirement for the Borough is 78 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers of which 20 are for those who either definitely or are likely to meet the definition. With 23 pitches granted permission since 2016 the PPTS requirement has already been met. However, 55 pitches still need to be provided, and in practice some of these will be for those meeting the definition. Following a call for sites and consideration of public land, the TBP as submitted includes allocations for a further 17 pitches<sup>7</sup>, leaving 38 still to be identified in the period to 2031, a challenging figure.
30. Whilst satisfied that few suitable sites have come forward and the Council has generally taken a proactive approach to site finding, one existing site providing seven pitches at Brookside Stables, Badgeworth, which has had a succession of temporary consents, has not been allocated despite meeting the site selection requirements for inclusion in the Preferred Options Consultation in 2018. The reasons for excluding the site following that consultation are unconvincing. The site should be allocated in the TBP thus reducing the shortfall to 31 pitches which will need to met through planning applications assessed against the criteria in Policy SD13.

#### Settlement boundaries

31. A number of substantially built up areas are not included within settlement boundaries (SBs). Amongst others, this would mean Policy RES3 applies rather than RES2, and EMP4 rather than EMP3, which would not be justified. These areas should therefore be included within defined SBs on the Policies Map. There is no reason why SBs should only be defined for recognised settlements in the JCS hierarchy, they should distinguish

---

<sup>7</sup> Excluding Land adjacent to Fieldview, A38, The Leigh which is now unavailable.



more widely between built up and countryside areas so that the geographic coverage of the policies in the TBP is justified and effective.

### Use Classes Order

32. Following recent changes to the Use Classes Order (UCO), the JCS definition of B-class employment land now straddles uses which form part of Class E and hence allows for changes of use of existing land both to and from the definition. To implement the JCS strategy the relevant employment land uses should continue to be defined in the TBP. In relation to future changes of use, the aim of the UCO is to increase flexibility. Whilst policies can refer to the potential for restricting future changes of use by condition, this must be fully justified in each case and not pursued as a matter of course.
33. The UCO also subsumes the town centre uses A1, A2 and A3 into the wide-ranging Commercial, Business & Service Class E which affects the RET policies in the submitted plan. The objective of concentrating and protecting suitable uses in designated retail centres and the primary shopping area in Tewkesbury by means of reworded policies remains sound. However, the intention of the UCO is to allow flexibility and any restrictions on future changes of use by condition must again be fully justified on a case by case basis.

### Next steps

34. Once the detailed wording of the MMs has been agreed by me, these should be published for consultation. The Council is now invited to draw up a detailed schedule of MMs for my approval via the programme officer. A template is attached.
35. The starting point is the submitted plan. I have taken account of the Council's suggested 'Schedule of Changes to the Pre-Submission Plan' (CD011c) but many of these are not essential to ensure a sound plan and are not therefore a matter for me. The Council may make Additional Modifications (AMs) to the plan but these should not materially affect the policies of the plan. There is no opportunity to make further policy changes to the plan or add additional policy requirements at this stage unless essential for soundness. AMs should therefore only be of a minor or factual nature and are entirely a matter for the Council.
36. Unless an omission emerges the appendix to this letter is the definitive list of the MMs which are required. Where specific wording has been provided there may be some flexibility provided the objective of the change to the plan is maintained. MMs are to the policies or explanatory text of the plan and its appendices. MMs should be numbered MM1, MM2 etc and each may cover a policy together with related changes to associated text. Minor consequential changes, renumbering of paragraphs etc will be necessary throughout the document but these need not be listed separately in the MM schedule and fall into the category of AMs for the Council to progress.
37. The Policies Map is a geographic illustration of where the various policies in the TBP apply, and certain amendments are necessary to it for the geographic application of the policies to be justified and effective. Where the Policies Map needs to be amended from that submitted with the TBP, the changes should be published in a schedule alongside the MMs and also form part of the consultation. These changes include deleted or added sites and amended boundaries and are listed in the appendix.
38. Although the Council is not invited to make representations on the contents of this letter and its appendix, if there are any omissions, inconsistencies or ambiguities any requests for clarification should be made through the programme officer. Comments

from interested parties are not invited at this stage as there will be full consultation on the MMs.

39. Please submit a draft schedule of MMs and a schedule of amendments to the Policies Map via the programme officer for my consideration and final approval prior to commencing public consultation.

40. As you are aware the MMs will need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment may need to be updated or an addendum produced to take them into account. These documents should be published alongside the MMs in due course for the assistance of consultees.

41. A copy of this letter should be placed on the examination website.

Yours sincerely

*David Reed*

INSPECTOR



## **APPENDIX – OUTLINE OF MAIN MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED (IN PLAN ORDER)**

To ensure the plan is sound, the following main modifications are required. Numbers refer to the PM numbers in CD011c, the Council's suggested schedule of changes to the plan. Some editing and amendments will be required to these.

SB: Settlement Boundary

### **MM1: Policy RES1 Housing Site Allocations**

Amend Table 1 as follows:

TEW2 – delete as permission granted pre-April 2020 – show site within SB

BIS1 – delete as permission granted pre-April 2020 – show site within SB

BIS2 – amend site capacity to 65 dwellings as per planning permission 19/00758/OUT

COO2 – amend to 25 dwellings as per planning permission 18/0000173/FUL

GOT1 – delete as permission granted pre-April 2020 – show site within SB

GOT2 – delete as permission granted pre-April 2020 – show site within SB

MAI1 – delete as permission granted pre-April 2020 – show site within SB

SHU1 – delete allocation

FOR1 – delete allocation

Add at end: Total indicative capacity: 927-997 dwellings

### **MM2: Policies TEW1, TEW4, BIS2, BIS3 & SHU2 09, 12, 13, 14A, 18**

### **MM3: Policy WIN1**

Allocation to be within 115 m contour and field boundaries; add No 2 Orchard Road.

Amend bullet point 4 to state:

Good accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities from the site to the town centre and services and facilities elsewhere in the town is important and should be secured by the proposal. Permeability within the site and connectivity with adjacent streets should therefore be provided, including a pedestrian/cycling route to the south east and/or south to facilitate easy access to the town centre.

### **MM4: Policy COO1**

Add at end of bullet 4: '... including by providing alternative natural greenspace on site.'

### **MM5: Delete Policy SHU1**

### **MM6: Delete Policy FOR1**

### **MM7: Insert new paragraph 3.22a into plan:**

As a result of the RES1 allocations, the updated sources of housing land supply in the Borough to meet the Joint Core Strategy requirement as at April 2020 are as follows:

Source	Supply
Completions	5,579
Commitments	1,882
Windfall sites	414
Mitton (Wychavon)	500
TBP allocations (927-997)	962
Total	9,337
JCS requirement	9,900
Shortfall still to be provided	563

**MM8:** Insert new paragraph 3.22b into plan to refer to the updated five year supply calculation in a new appendix 6 to the plan and the updated housing trajectory in a new appendix 7 (see below). Incorporate 20



**MM9: Policy RES4 New housing at other rural settlements**

Amend to 'as a general indication no more than 5% growth during the plan period will be allowed' (delete 'or 10 dwellings, whichever is the lesser') Incorporate 22B

**MM10: Policy RES5 24A**

**MM11: Policy RES7 26A**

**MM12: Policy RES11 27A/27B**

**MM13: Policy RES12 28/29**

**MM14: Policy RES13 '2. Up to 5% self and custom build housing plots....'**

Add at end 'Any viability constraints affecting the potential housing mix will need to be fully justified at planning application stage.'

**MM15: Policy GTTS1 Site Allocations for Gypsies & Travellers**

Delete:

The Leigh Land adjacent to Fieldview, A38 0.37 ha 8 pitches

Include allocation from Preferred Options consultation:

Badgeworth Brookside Stables, Cold Pool Lane 0.29 ha 7 pitches

**MM16: Policy EMP1 Major Employment Sites**

Reword to state:

'...will support in principle proposals for offices, research & development, light industrial, general industrial, storage and distribution development. It is expected that new development at these sites will normally be for these employment uses only. Proposals for limited development outside these uses may be supported...'

Add third sentence: 'Conditions to limit changes of use within or beyond these employment uses may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to reasoned justification.

Replace 'TBP Extension (Ha)' column with 'Notes'

Include in Notes column:

Malvern View Business Park – 2.24 ha extension allocated on adjacent land

Ashville Business Park – Planning permission granted for 3.5 ha extension

Bamfurlong Industrial Park – Planning permission granted on 5.9 ha of adjacent land

**MM17: Policy EMP2 Rural Business Centres**

Reword to state:

'...will support in principle proposals for employment development as defined in Policy EMP1.'

Add second sentence: 'Conditions to limit changes of use within or beyond these employment uses may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to reasoned justification.

Knightsbridge Business Centre – delete 2.2 ha extension

Orchard Industrial Estate – delete 6.5 ha extension

Isbourne Business Centre – delete 2.11 ha extension

**MM18: Policy EMP3**

Reword to state:

'...for employment uses (as defined in Policy EMP1) within settlement boundaries...'

Add second sentence: 'Conditions to limit changes of use within or beyond these employment uses may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to reasoned justification.



**MM19: Policy EMP4**

Reword to state:

'...proposals for new agricultural or employment development (as defined in Policy EMP1) will be supported in principle...'

Add further sentence: 'Conditions to limit changes of use within or beyond these employment uses may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to reasoned justification.

**MM20: Policy EMP5 42/43/44B/44C (not reference to BATNEEC)**

**MM21: Policy EMP6**

Reword to state: 'Employment sites will be safeguarded for employment uses as defined in Policy EMP1 and the loss or change of use of a site to non-employment uses will generally be resisted. The loss of employment land will only be acceptable...'

Associated changes to reasoned justification.

45E

**MM22: Policy AGR1 46A/46C**

**MM23: Policy GRB1 Green Belt Review**

Delete and replace with:

'The Green Belt inset boundary around Shurdington has been reviewed and extended to reflect the existing built up area of the village. This will allow scope for some limited infilling and redevelopment, including housing site SHU2, whilst avoiding any outward encroachment into the surrounding countryside which would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. The boundary of the Green Belt is shown on the policies map'.

Revise introduction & reasoned justification paragraphs in relation to Shurdington and to explain the Council's decision that there are very special circumstances that justify the grant of planning permission for employment development in the Green Belt at Ashville Business Park and adjacent to Bamfurlong Industrial Park.

**MM24: Policy GRB2 Gloucestershire Airport**

Amend first sentence to state:

The Non-Essential Operational Area of Gloucestershire Airport will be extended as shown on the Policies Map.

**MM25: New Policy GRB4**

Include new policy and reasoned justification based on the NPPF to replace Policy GRB1 in the 2006 Local Plan.

**MM26: Policy RET1**

List local centres to be provided in strategic allocations by name as per 50A

50B reworded: '...retail related uses in these locations which are defined for the purposes of this plan as retail shops, restaurants and cafes, financial and professional services, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways. Within these areas...'

50C

Paragraph 6.9 reword 'One exception to this is office development which will also be acceptable...'

**MM27: Policy RET2**

51A but reword second sentence: '...proposals for retail shops (other than hot food) will be supported. Where permission is required, the change of use from retail shops will be permitted provided that...'

Elsewhere replace Class A1 with 'retail shops'



Amend last sentence to say 'Where permission is required, proposals involving the change of use...'

Add further sentence: 'Within Tewkesbury Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area, conditions to limit changes of use may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to the reasoned justification.

**MM28: Policy RET3**

52A but first sentence to say 'designated retail centres' and second sentence to start 'Where permission is required, the change of use from retail related uses will only be supported...'

Add further sentence: 'Within the designated retail centres, conditions to limit changes of use may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

Associated changes to the reasoned justification.

**MM29: Policy RET4 53A/53C with some editing**

53A with new sentence at end: 'Conditions to limit changes of use may be imposed on new planning permissions if justified on a case by case basis.'

**MM30: Policy RET5 54A (excluding BATNEEC)**

Last sentence to start 'Where permission is required...'

**MM31: Policy RET8 56A/56D**

**MM32: Policy DES1**

Add at end of first paragraph: 'Any departure from the standards, whether for viability or physical achievability reasons, will need to be fully justified at planning application stage.'

Paragraph 7.7 – delete 'some exceptional'

**MM33: Policy HER5 59B/61A/61B**

**MM34: Policy LAN2:** Delete and replace with a policy to protect the landscape characteristics identified for the various landscape character types and character areas identified by the Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment prepared by LDA Design in January 2006.

**MM35: Policy LAN3** – Retitle 'Gaps of Local Importance' and use that term throughout

**MM36: Policy NAT1 65A/65B/65C/65D/65E/65G/65H/65L**

**MM37: Policy NAT3 66A/66B/66C**

**MM38: Policy ENV1 67**

**MM39: Policy ENV2 68A/68B**

**MM40: Policy ENV3 69**

**MM41: Policy RCN2 71A**

**MM42: Policy COM3** – delete 'and health'

**MM43: Appendix 2**

Add Victoria Gardens, Tewkesbury

**MM44: Appendix 3**

Delete Deerhurst & Mythe Railway GWT Reserves



**MM45:** Insert new Appendix 6 to show five-year supply calculation as at April 2020 including TBP allocations – TBC Matter 2 Statement Figure 5 adjusted

**MM46:** Insert new Appendix 7 to show overall housing trajectory 2011-2031 as at April 2020 including TBP allocations – TBC Matter 2 Statement Figure 6 adjusted

### **POLICIES MAP**

The following amendments are necessary to the submitted Policies Map for the geographic application of the policies in the TBP to be justified and effective.

Inset maps to be left blank on larger scale key map to avoid potential conflicts  
Add notation for JCS strategic allocations and safeguarded areas for clarity

TEW4 allocation – exclude part of site in SSSI

WIN1 allocation – include site of No 2 Orchard Road

SHU1 allocation in Shurdington – delete and reinstate site in Green Belt  
Green Belt Partial Review Sites P30 & P31 (undeveloped sites in AONB east of the A46 in Shurdington) – reinstate in Green Belt

FOR1 allocation - delete

GTTS1 allocations:

Delete allocation at Land adjacent to Fieldview, A38, The Leigh

Add allocation at Brookside Stables, Cold Pool Lane, Badgeworth

Add existing Gypsy & Traveller sites protected under JCS Policy SD13

EMP1 allocations:

Amend extent of Malvern View Business Park in line with permission 18/00249/OUT & include whole site in SB

Site adjacent to Ashville Business Park - reinstate in Green Belt

Sites adjacent to Meteor Business Park and Bamfurlong Business Park – reinstate in Green Belt and airport EOA

EMP2 - delete extensions adjacent to Knightsbridge Business Centre, Orchard Industrial Estate & Isbourne Business Centre

GRB1 - reinstate in Green Belt the SHU1 housing site, Partial Review sites P30 & P31 & sites adjacent to Ashville, Meteor & Bamfurlong Business Parks.

GRB2 – show extension to Airport NEOA west of the South East Camp & reinstate sites adjacent to Meteor & Bamfurlong Business Parks in the Airport EOA.

LAN2 – delete designation

LAN4 – add Victoria Gardens Tewkesbury, correct boundary at Green Street, Brockworth

LAN5 – add Alderton Playing Fields

NAT1 - delete Deerhurst & Mythe Railway GWT Reserves



## NAT4 – add Tewkesbury Nature Reserve

### Additional areas to be included within settlement boundaries:

Housing estate north of Grovefield Way/Cold Pool Lane, Cheltenham

Housing estate west of Farm Lane/north of Leckhampton Lane, Cheltenham

Housing estate west of Cockcroft Lane, Prestbury

North east Hucclecote

Homecroft Drive and area south of A4019, Ucklington (If desired Civil Service Sports Ground to be designated as a Locally Important Open Space under Policy LAN4)

Northway area east of M5

Ashchurch village & DE&S MOD site

Twigworth west of A38 as per neighbourhood plan

Curtilage of Field House, Blacksmiths Lane, Maisemore